

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES



744 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

October 26, 1988

ALL COUNTY INFORMATION NOTICE No. I-108-88

TO: ALL COUNTY WELFARE DIRECTORS

SUBJECT: REVISION OF THE AFDC AND FOOD STAMP COUNTY CORRECTIVE
ACTION PLANNING HANDBOOK

The AFDC and Food Stamp County Corrective Action Planning Handbook has been revised due to the passage of HR 4060 which provides for the inclusion of underissuances in the Food Stamp payment error rate. For the Corrective Action Plan due January 15, 1989 (for the period April 1988 through September 1988), Counties should include underissuances when reporting the County's Food Stamp payment error rate as well as any corrective actions developed to address underissuances. Pages 3-10 of the AFDC and Food Stamp County Corrective Action Planning Handbook have been revised to reflect this change and should be incorporated into the Handbook distributed via All County Information Notice I-92-88.

Although the AFDC program does not currently require the inclusion of underpayments in the error rate, we anticipate this may change in the future. For that reason, we encourage Counties to give added emphasis to reducing underpayments as well as underissuances.

My staff is available to assist you in your error reduction efforts. If you have any questions about this letter or the corrective action planning process, please contact your Corrective Action Bureau Consultant at (916) 445-4458 or ATSS 485-4458.


ROBERT A. HOREL
Deputy Director

Attachment

cc: CWDA
Corrective Action Coordinators

Length of Annual Plan and Progress Report

Neither the annual plan nor the semiannual progress report is intended to be an exercise in unnecessary documentation. There is, however, no simple guideline to how long either should be. The plan and progress report should be long enough to communicate the essential information; they ought to be thorough without being tedious. A county with no QC errors might simply report those findings and that no new actions were planned. A large county with several significant error elements, each involving breakdowns in complex procedures and/or systems in various districts, would need to go to some length to report their findings and their plans. The important point is to use the problem solving and corrective action processes to meet your county's needs. Remember that the quality of a plan is not measured by its weight.

Small Counties

Small counties without QC samples will need to base their plans on whatever case review data they collect. The plans of small counties will typically be briefer and rely less on statistical techniques. However, the same process of measuring case management performance and responding to the results of that measurement should occur and should be reported.

Please consult the Small County Handbook for further problem solving and planning assistance.

Counties with Low Error Rates

Several counties have raised the issue of whether counties below a given error rate should be required to submit a report. All counties are required to submit a corrective action plan. However, the plans of counties with very low error rates will be shorter because of the very nature of the process. We already cited the example of the county which would simply report finding no QC errors. A county with, say, a one percent dollar error rate spread over four error elements could report the QC findings and that no single error element was large enough to warrant a corrective action effort. A county might also have only one element requiring analysis and corrective action implementation. The point is that while every county must submit a plan, counties with very low error rates will have plans which are very brief and require a minimum of time to prepare.

Timing

Error prevention is an ongoing process, not one which occurs at six-month intervals. The corrective action plan and the six-month progress report are not intended to interfere with effective error prevention efforts which may be monthly or quarterly in nature. Again, the reporting format is flexible enough to allow for reporting of activities regardless of when they occur.

Finally, do not hesitate to call the Corrective Action Bureau (CAB) at (916) 445-4458 with questions or suggestions for tailoring your corrective action plan to your county's needs. Also, remember that CAB staff is available to assist you with technical consultation on any part of the process.

I.A. Error Magnitude and Type

1. Error Magnitude

Instructions - The information required differs for counties with QC samples and those small counties without QC.

QC Counties - Array the appropriate six months' QC data in the following format:

QC Period: _____

a. AFDC

- 1) Combined ineligibility and overpayment error rate:
Dollar errors with technical errors removed: _____ %

All data elements below must include technical errors.

Dollar errors: _____ %
Agency caused: _____ %

Client caused: _____ %

Case errors: _____ %
Agency caused: _____ %

Client caused: _____ %

- 2) Overpayments

Dollar error rate: _____ %
Agency caused: _____ %

Client caused: _____ %

Case error rate: _____ %
Agency caused: _____ %

Client caused: _____ %

- 3) Ineligibility

Dollar error rate: _____ %
Agency caused: _____ %

Client caused: _____ %

Case error rate: _____ %
Agency caused: _____ %

Client caused: _____ %

4) Underpayments

Dollar error rate: _____% Agency caused: _____%

Client caused: _____%

Case error rate: _____% Agency caused: _____%

Client caused: _____%

5) QC Sample

Cases drawn: _____

Cases reviewed: _____ Total dollars: _____

Average monthly caseload: _____

Percent of caseload in QC sample: _____%

b. Food Stamps

1) Combined ineligibility, overissuance and underissuance error rate:

Dollar errors: _____% Agency caused: _____%

Client caused: _____%

Case errors: _____% Agency caused: _____%

Client caused: _____%

2) Overissuances:

Dollar error rate: _____% Agency caused: _____%

Client caused: _____%

Case error rate: _____% Agency caused: _____%

Client caused: _____%

3) Ineligibility

Dollar error rate: _____% Agency caused: _____%
Client caused: _____%
Case error rate: _____% Agency caused: _____%
Client caused: _____%

4) Underissuances

Dollar error rate: _____% Agency caused: _____%
Client caused: _____%
Case error rate: _____% Agency caused: _____%
Client caused: _____%

5) QC Sample

Cases drawn: _____
Cases reviewed: _____ Total dollars: _____
Average monthly caseload: _____
Percent of caseload in QC sample: _____%

Non-QC Counties - Array information on your county's errors as gathered by special studies, QA reviews, supervisory reviews, etc. Indicate both the data and their source (such as a dollar error rate of 3.2% based on supervisory reviews of 80 cases in the review period).

Discussion - The format for display of findings in the QC counties is a rearrangement of the data elements counties have been using for several years. The sections of the plan which follow "Magnitude" will call for further analysis of these findings. If your county has additional information (QA, IRIS, supervisory reviews, special studies, etc.), please include that information separately and compare it with the QC findings. Do not combine QC data and other case review findings. Also, compare the magnitude of errors and source (agency v. client) with previous findings.

Checklist

- Did you cite changes in error magnitude?
- Has the distribution of client and agency errors changed?
- Have you included available information from sources other than QC?

Example

QC Period: . April - September 1987

a. AFDC

1) Combined ineligibility and overpayment error rate:

Dollar errors with technical errors removed: (AFDC only) 3.9 %
All data elements below must include technical errors.

Dollar errors: 6.3 %

Agency caused: 3.8 %

Client caused: 2.5 %

Case errors: 7.0 %

Agency caused: 4.1 %

Client caused: 2.9 %

2) Overpayments

Dollar error rate: 2.7 %

Agency caused: 1.6 %

Client caused: 1.1 %

Case error rate: 3.6 %

Agency caused: 2.2 %

Client caused: 1.4 %

3) Ineligibility

Dollar error rate: 3.6 %

Agency caused: 2.2 %

Client caused: 1.4 %

Case error rate: 3.4 %

Agency caused: 1.9 %

Client caused: 1.5 %

4) Underpayments

Dollar error rate: 2.4 %

Agency caused: 1.9 %

Client caused: 0.5 %

Case error rate: 3.4 %

Agency caused: 2.1 %

Client caused: 1.3 %

5) QC Sample

Cases drawn: 183

Cases reviewed: 139

Total dollars: \$64,399

Average monthly caseload: 6,483

Percent of caseload in reviewed QC sample: 2.1 %

b. Food Stamps

1) Combined ineligibility, overissuance and underissuance error rate:

Dollar errors: 6.5 %

Agency caused: 5.1 %

Client caused: 1.4 %

Case errors: 14.8 %

Agency caused: 11.3 %

Client caused: 3.5 %

2) Overissuances

Dollar error rate: 3.3 %

Agency caused: 2.9 %

Client caused: 0.4 %

Case error rate: 7.2 %

Agency caused: 6.0 %

Client caused: 1.2 %

3) Ineligibility

Dollar error rate: 0.9 %

Agency caused: 0.7 %

Client caused: 0.2 %

Case error rate: 2.4 %

Agency caused: 1.2 %

Client caused: 1.2 %

4) Underissuances

Dollar error rate: 2.3 %

Agency caused: 1.5 %

Client caused: 0.8 %

Case error rate: 5.2 %

Agency caused: 4.1 %

Client caused: 1.1 %

5) QC Sample

Cases drawn: 100

Cases reviewed: 83

Total dollars: \$8,121

Average monthly caseload: 14,861

Percent of caseload in reviewed QC sample: 0.6 %

I.A2. Error Elements

Instructions - Using the error elements from QC, list the error elements of the six-month period in declining order of dollar impact. For non-QC counties who cannot generate these data, list the major error types in declining order using whatever data are available. QC counties should array the data as follows:

Error Element	Dollar Error Rate	Case Error Rate	Dollars in Error	Cases in Error
1. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____

ETC.

Again, if your county has additional information from other sources, please include it. You may wish to break out agency vs. client errors for each element.

Discussion - The identification of the error elements making the greatest contribution to your county's error rate is an essential step in selecting where to focus your corrective action efforts. Because the limited size of the QC sample makes ranking of individual error elements less precise than the measurement of overall error rates, it is important to include and consider whatever additional information your county may have. For example, if your county does extensive quality assurance desk reviews, compare the QA findings with the QC findings on error elements. If the findings are close, you can have confidence that the findings in both are valid. Also, compare your own county's ranking of error elements with the latest statewide findings. If your county is far from the state's pattern, you will want to explore the reasons for these differences. Finally, be certain to compare this review period to previous QC findings for your county. Are there trends? Are new problems emerging?

Checklist

- Are the data on error elements sufficiently extensive and consistent to know with confidence which are the major problems?
- Have you reviewed all available information including QC, IRIS reviews, special studies, supervisor reviews, QA, statewide findings, etc.?
- Have you checked historical data to see what trends exist?